



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

than that presented in the *Documentary History*. It is accordingly to be presumed that Mr. Hunt intends these two volumes to have a separate existence and circulation from that of the rest of his series. This, as an accurate, legible, and intelligent edition of Madison's notes, they well deserve.

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON.

The Creevey Papers; a Selection from the Correspondence and Diaries of the late Thomas Creevey, M.P. Born 1768; died 1838. Edited by the Right Hon. Sir HERBERT MAXWELL, Bart., M.P., LL.D., F.R.S. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company; London: John Murray. 1903. Two vols., pp. xxiv, 342; x, 372.)

STUDENTS of English political history of the period extending from the French Revolution to the accession of Queen Victoria have good reason to congratulate themselves on the remarkable find which has been made by Sir Herbert Maxwell. They would be still more in Sir Herbert Maxwell's debt had he edited the Creevey letters, reminiscences, and journals with the care which their historical value and interest demand. The editing, however, has been done with scant claim to consistency and with little of the extreme care that marks the editing by the late Mr. L. J. Jennings of the *Croker Papers*, with which as regards historical value the *Creevey Papers* have been frequently compared. The period covered by the two sets of papers is practically the same. Both Croker and Creevey wrote much of George IV. and William IV. and of the Duke of Wellington. Both dealt with the downfall of the old Toryism, and the end of the unreformed House of Commons, and with the internal condition of the two great political parties in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century. Croker, however, with all his shortcomings, was a statesman as compared with Creevey; and he stood for something in the House of Commons. Creevey was also long of the House of Commons. He wrote a pamphlet in favor of parliamentary reform, and grouped himself with Radicals such as Whitbread, Romilly, and Hume. But he was of the House of Commons chiefly for the social advantages which accrued to him through his being there; and while he was intimate with all the leading Whig politicians from the time of Fox to the Melbourne ministry, he apparently carried no weight in their councils, and he certainly made no lasting reputation as a member. So much is this the case that there is no mention of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography*; and Sir Herbert Maxwell has done but little to trace out Creevey's career.

Creevey was of Irish extraction but was born in Liverpool, where his father was a merchant. He went to Queen's College, Cambridge, in 1786, and after taking his B.A. degree in 1789 he was admitted as a student at the Inner Temple. In 1791, while still a student, he transferred himself to Gray's Inn, and was finally called to the bar in June, 1794. While in Liverpool he had been a friend of Dr. Currie and William Roscoe; and from his association with these prominent members of the

group of Unitarians and reformers then established there, he was a Radical in politics before he was called to the bar. There is no account of his ever having joined a circuit or sought practice at the bar; but in 1802 he went into the House as one of the members for the borough of Thetford, at that time controlled by the eleventh Duke of Norfolk, who as a Roman Catholic could not sit in the House of Lords, but who had it in his power to return five or six members to the House of Commons. Creevey, it need not be said, was a nominated member. With the exception of a few years after he was dropped in 1826 by the Earl of Thanet, he was in the House of Commons from 1802 till 1832, when Downton, the borough he represented in the last unreformed Parliament, was disfranchised by the Reform Act.

The Earl of Thanet was his patron from 1820 to 1826, during which time Creevey represented the Westmorland borough of Appleby. In 1831 he was taken up by the Earl of Radnor, who returned him for the burghage borough of Downton — a borough in which half the ancient vote-houses had long been under water, and the patron of which made it a condition with the members he returned at the general election of 1831 that they should vote for the Reform Bill and incidentally for the disfranchisement of Downton. Creevey was thus of the House of Commons for nearly a quarter of a century. Yet in the whole of his published correspondence there is scarcely a reference to his constituents. Apparently he seldom or never went near them, and he certainly held himself in no responsibility toward them. He was, in fact, a typical nominated member of the last generation of the old House of Commons, governed in his relations to his patrons by the code which had grown up since the seventeenth century regulating the political conduct of nominated members toward the patrons who returned them.

All Creevey's patrons were either Whigs or Radicals; and his relations toward them as well as his own inclinations and interest — for Creevey was always on the lookout for office — made him a steadfast adherent of the Whig party in the House of Commons. His political creed when he entered Parliament in 1802 "was simple and within a very narrow compass — devotion to Fox". His attitude toward his patrons is admirably summed up in a letter he wrote to Miss Ord, his stepdaughter, on the death in 1825 of the Earl of Thanet, by whose interest he then sat for Appleby. "The death of poor Thanet", he wrote, "makes a great difference in my feelings as to Parliamentary attendance. It was due to him to be present at my post. I feel no such obligation to the present Earl, or my dear constituents." His disregard of the new Earl of Thanet apparently cost him his seat at Appleby. He was dropped by Thanet at the general election in 1826; and then turned for a seat at Winchelsea to Lord Darlington, whose boroughmongering later on earned him the dukedom of Cleveland. Creevey had an interview with Lord Darlington, and found that they were of one mind in politics, except on the corn-laws, to the abrogation of which Darlington, as a great landowner, was strongly opposed. "However," explained

Creevey, "any such discussion appeared to me unnecessary, because there was no principle I held more sacred than that when one gentleman held a gratuitous seat in Parliament from another, and any difference arose in their politics, the former was bound in honour to surrender." This was the code which for more than a century preceding the Reform Act governed the attitude of a nominated member to his patron when he had made no cash payment for his seat. Throughout his many years in Parliament, Creevey lived loyally up to this code. The Countess of Stafford, the Duke of Norfolk's mother-in-law, evidently had some part in the ending of Creevey's connection with Thetford; and his correspondence of the periods when he had been dropped by one patron, and was on the hunt for a new one, makes it plain that women at times played quite a part in bringing about the introduction of men who were seeking seats to patrons who had them in their gift.

Creevey had neither money nor influential relatives when he was called to the bar in 1794. How he came to be favorably introduced to his first borough-patron, the Duke of Norfolk, is not recorded. But his becoming of the House of Commons perhaps made him "marriage known", in the phrase that was used in the eighteenth century in connection with needy Irish peers who bought seats in the Parliament at Westminster; for in 1803 he married the widow of William Ord, of Whitfield Hall, Northumberland, whose son was of the House of Commons, first as member for Morpeth and later on for Newcastle-on-Tyne. Mrs. Ord was the daughter of Charles John Brandling, also a member for Newcastle-on-Tyne; and her sister was the wife of Rowland Burdon, member for Durham. His marriage put Creevey in a position of independence as regards money; and his new connections added to his social and parliamentary importance. Creevey had no great talents—none that were calculated to advance him into the front rank of parliamentary life. Neither had he any political ideals. He had, however, social qualities of a kind which were serviceable to a man in public life in the days of the Regency, and a talent for ingratiating himself and making himself useful in society. When the Whigs were in power, these helped him into three easy and well-paid offices: secretary of the Board of Control; treasurer of the Ordnance, with comfortable quarters in the Tower; and a governorship of Chelsea Hospital, an office which he held at the time of his death in 1838.

Students of the great questions which agitated England between the end of the war with France and the beginning of the reign of Queen Victoria will look in vain in the *Creevey Papers* before 1832 for any new material affecting these issues. In this respect these volumes differ from the *Croker Papers*; for Croker was strenuously concerned on the Tory side in all these questions, while Creevey was concerned chiefly with the overthrow of the Tories and the redistribution of offices which was to follow their downfall. But concerning the various groups in the Tory and Liberal parties between the peace after Waterloo and the reform of the House of Commons, there is an abundance of material, much of it

undoubtedly fresh and of value ; while of the personalities of English politics of this period it is doubtful whether there is a biography in existence which cannot be further enriched by citations from the Creevey journals and letters. The period was a sordid one, and its seamy side is often prominent in Creevey's descriptions of his contemporaries. Grey's reputation is enhanced by Creevey's memoirs ; so is the Duke of Wellington's ; but in hardly any other set of memoirs is Brougham shown in a worse light, or is there a more positively depressing picture of the state into which royalty had fallen in the first thirty years of the nineteenth century.

Much the same tone prevails with regard to political parties. Except for the adherence of the Whigs to reform, there was very little to choose between them and the Tories ; for both viewed the spoils of office in the same light. From the point of view of party history Creevey's memoirs are most serviceable in showing the condition of the Whig party in the years between the death of Fox and the accession of Grey to the leadership — in the period when Ponsonby and Tierney, both of whom had been of the Irish House of Commons, were in charge of the fortunes of the Whigs and Radicals in the lower house at Westminster. There is an informing chapter covering Creevey's visit to Ireland in 1828, especially valuable for the light it throws on the condition of Ireland between the Union and the emancipation of the Roman Catholics in 1829. For the three years 1830, 1831, and 1832 also Creevey's letters and journals are of unquestionable usefulness. He was behind the scenes during the final stages of the movement for reform ; and his correspondence at this critical time forms a serviceable addition to the *Correspondence of William IV. and Grey* ; *Grey's Letters to Princess Lieven* ; and the *Croker Papers*.

It is fortunate that the Creevey Papers have been unearthed ; but the discoverer of them can scarcely have realized their full value, or he would have taken more trouble with his biographical sketch of Creevey, and would have given closer and more continuous attention to the editing of the material and especially to the foot-notes. These are unevenly and capriciously done. Many instances of this could be cited. It will be sufficient, however, to cite Creevey's Liverpool friends, Dr. Currie and William Roscoe. No one would imagine from Sir Herbert Maxwell's brief notes introducing these correspondents of Creevey's that both of them were active Liberal politicians to whom places will have to be assigned in any comprehensive history of Liberalism and Nonconformity in England.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Studies in Napoleonic Statesmanship : Germany. By HERBERT A. L. FISHER, M.A., Fellow of New College. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press ; New York: Henry Frowde. 1903. Pp. xii, 392.)

MR. FISHER is not an apologist for the Napoleonic régime. He points out in detail its inherent defects and the extortions which were